

> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Harold\_Varmus@nih.gov [[mailto:Harold\\_Varmus@nih.gov](mailto:Harold_Varmus@nih.gov)]  
> Sent: Friday, July 23, 1999 12:09 AM  
> To: Diane Sullenberger  
> Cc: dl2a@nih.gov; ncozzare@socrates.berkeley.edu; Ken Fulton  
> Subject: Re: Fwd: ebiomed  
>  
>  
>  
> It is unfortunate that we did not recognize the difference of opinion on  
> this issue of "site access" during our very productive and congenial  
> conversation today, because it is a critical one that I believe we could  
> have resolved with additional talk. David and I feel very  
> strongly that  
> content should be accessible, not just searchable, on the E-biomed (or  
> E-biosci) site. Only in this way can the full range of approaches to the

> site's contents---and thus the E-biomed proposal itself---be adequately  
> tested. Of course, as we said to Nick, we have no reservations about  
> providing easy and multiple links to the same content at other  
> sites (e.g.,  
> at HighWire or individual journal or society sites). Then the scientific  
> community's predilection for working in one way or the other can be  
> appropriately evaluated. Otherwise we would be "protecting" the other  
> sites for no obvious reason and failing to offer our constituency the best  
> shot at an optimal system. I think you are probably correct in your  
> analysis of the impact of this issue on the willingness of journals to  
> provide content early, but I favor the "dual access" approach (your option  
> 3) even if it means that some journals would opt initially for a delay  
> after publication before contributing their contents to E-biomed.  
>  
> I hope we can continue this conversation by e-mail (even though I will now  
> be away for four days and may not be reading my mail), because I  
> would like  
> to insure that the issue is sufficiently well explored that it can be  
> appropriately presented to the Council and the Publications Committee.  
> PNAS and NAS are in a pivotal position in the development of electronic  
> publication, and I hope that our large areas of agreement are not put in  
> the shade by this important difference in approach.  
>